1.   Claims 22-24 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over Hakim, in

view of Gossett et al. The Office Action cites Gossett, in combination with Hakim as base

reference, for the proposition that "the source gateway 108 selects a destination gateway 114

from among the list provided by the service point 112…" The references, alone and in

combination, do not teach or suggest Applicant's amended claims.

Gossett describes a "routing engine", a centralized system for routing VoIP calls, wherein

the routing engine selects one destination gateway from among a plurality of destination

gateways eligible to receive/terminate the call (e.g., Gosset, col. 5, lines 14-19). This routing

engine requires that each destination gateway that may be so eligible must be registered/accepted

by a service point operator of Gossett (e.g., Gossett, col. 6, lines 21-41). This makes sense only

because of the primary reason/objective of Gossett -- i.e., Gossett is for obtaining call

connection, via a destination gateway that is chosen/selected by the routing engine from among

a plurality of *eligible* destination gateways, such as through a most economical/preferred one of

the *eligible* destination gateways.

Applicant's amended claims, on the other hand, address dissociation of centralized

feature platform upon call authentication. Specifically, Applicant's amendments more distinctly

and particularly point out that the step of "re-directing" the call (from the authentication service,

once call is authenticated, to the target device) is performed by the network, and not any

authentication server or the like. In other words, Applicant's amended claims provide for hand-

off of the call, via IP address of intended recipient, upon authentication, wherein the hand-off

allows the regular IP network (via IP address of target device, DNS addressing and the like; and

not by or because of particular *eligible* gateway or authentication server infrastructure at source

or destination) to route the call from initial gateway to the target device. This is significantly different than the "routing engine" of Gossett. Gossett, in effect, is dependent on particular source and destination gateways for the authentication list; whereas, Applicant's amended claims address a centralized feature platform that handles authentication only and not routing in manner "dependent" on particular source or destination equipment.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of all pending claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims 22-24 and 29-35, and issuance of a timely Notice of Allowance in this case.

If the Examiner has any questions or comments, the undersigned attorney for Applicant respectfully requests a call to discuss any issues. The Office is authorized to charge any excess fees or to credit any overage to the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-1350.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 6, 2007   By   / H. Dale Langley, Jr. /
                                       H. Dale Langley, Jr.
                                       Reg. No. 35,927

The Law Firm of H. Dale Langley, Jr., PC
610 West Lynn
Austin, Texas 78703
Telephone: (512) 477-3830
Facsimile: (512) 480-0858
E-Mail: dlangley@iptechlaw.com